

Vetoed once again

President Bush vetoes the Democrats' children's healthcare plan. Will Bush make it through his term?

Earlier this month, United States President George W. Bush vetoed a \$35 billion expansion to the State Children's Health Insurance Program, which would cover many more uninsured children in the States. This has raised the question "does George Bush care about our kids?"

With the veto, Bush stated that the children should "just go to a hospital," not noting that you need insurance to pay the potentially enormous fees and bills that are packed with it.

But still, *does* George Bush care about our kids – or our citizens overall? Ever since he took office, the quality of life and freedom of US citizens has diminished. The U.S. ranks 16th in the "freest" countries study, behind Canada and Australia. And now, it seems, he cares about the trillion-dollar war more than the people who thought he was going to help them. It seems obvious now that there will always be a terrorist somewhere in the world, with the sick mind that can't be cured. Bush must pull out now to save himself and his people.

Bushes' selfishness will cost him dearly, for there is bound to be another Republican to join the Democrats on October 18 to shoot back against the controversial veto. And if 15 cross over, Bush will have to cave in to the pressure amounted on him.

George Bush is having a weary last term, with a diminishing approval rating and no hope in any of his situations. Hillary Clinton, the frontrunner in the presidential race (see "2008: A new odyssey, a new America") is sure to win, and unless something devastating happens to her lead, she will end the war for good. She will do everything Bush *doesn't* want, including approving a huge healthcare plan ("Hillarycare 2.0") that Bush would push out of sight.

George Bush *doesn't* care about America's people, but only about his war. Plagued by the horrors of 9/11, Bush is dimly walking towards the end of a dark, cold tunnel. And his chances of survival are slimming. Will he make it out alive ... or dead?

2008:

a new odyssey, a new America.

DEMOCRATS

The Democrats lead the way in the US's presidential race this year, and are seeing no end to their success. Hillary Clinton currently leads in almost every poll imaginable, and she is the key to the dems success in 2008. The chances for Clinton are high, but anything could happen between now and the elections next autumn.

The other two, Barack Obama and John Edwards are seeing a dim future. At the beginning of the race, they were doing okay, but those good times have died down as Clinton eats into their poll numbers.

The other numerous candidates (8 or so) will only make it if they are the last ones standing.

If the Democrats win, it will be a devastating loss to the Republicans. The war will end and all sorts of Republican-hated bills and plans will go into effect. That includes:

- Nationwide healthcare plan
- Tax raise
- Budget increase in health, education and public services

REPUBLICANS

The Republicans are on a road to nowhere in the race, thanks to the guy in the White House that tarnished the GOP's reputation. As David Letterman stated, the #2 reason you won't get the Nobel Prize is because "you invaded Iraq without an exit strategy".

The GOP hopeful is Rudy Giuliani, who is just behind Clinton in some states. Thanks to his response in the wake of 9/11 and granted experience when it comes to terrorism, he is the main weapon against the Dems'. Fred Thompson might also get a chance, but for most of the "important issues" being asked, he lets the individual states make their decisions, instead of applying nationwide law.

Mitt Romney and John McCain are both doing fairly well, yet have both seen a drop in money and popularity recently. Unlike earlier this year, they aren't as great as they used to be.

The other 6 or so candidates have a very slim chance of making it to 2008. The Republicans will:

- Stay in Iraq
- Keep taxes low
- Imply new security laws

Freedom of dress?

Are school uniforms really justified, or are they limiting freedom of expression?

Already a feature in most western countries, school uniforms are growing in popularity. Is it really necessary or even fair, to force students to wear uniform or send them back home? You may be surprised at how harshly this concept has been treated in some areas.

For example, in the UK it is illegal to force uniform in schools. This also applies similarly to Queensland, Australia and the U.S. state of Massachusetts. A 1960s U.S. court case against school uniform also ended with that message: freedom of expression applies to schools as well.

A study published in The Journal of Education Research by David L. Brunnsma, of the University of Missouri, and Kerry A. Rockquemore, of the University of Notre Dame, stated that student uniforms don't improve attendance and discipline nor decreased drug use. According to Brunnsma and Rockquemore, uniforms did not significantly improve academic performance or students' attitudes toward school, peer-group relations were not improved, and that uniforms had a negative effect on student attitudes.

So is it really legal to kick someone out of school just because their shirt is red when it has to be green? Seriously, school is a place to learn, and when did wearing a shirt with the number 8 on it lower the campuses' exam average? Freedom at schools is being limited law after law, and the tipping point was when students were punished for supporting an Olympic march with a religious banner.

Dress codes and uniform rulings need to be limited severely so that the first amendment is protected. Countries should go back to the old way: no offensive or revealing dress, but anything else is OK. It could also be a waste of clothes, because all those colorful, patterned shirts and pants are restricted to weekends, leaving hundreds' worth in the drawer – and

conservation is everything these days. The other 49 states should imply a less strict law on freedom of expression in schools, because freedom applies to dress, and dressing differently reveals the true culture inside everyone.

What happened to real music?

The demise of music over the last two decades has left a scar in the music industry. Will music ever revert to the good times 30 years ago?

If you think about it, music and the artists that come and go with it have been failing over the past few years. Music itself is getting a moldy image, with all of today's tracks mostly comprised of pointless, repeated lyrics. Besides the tunes, the artists aren't lasting very long, either. All of today's famous pop stars have faded in and out of the music industry in only 3 years, thanks to countless DUI charges and drug stints that have had them shunned by society. Unlike many years ago, when music was written for the fun of it, musicians these days step up onto the stage to make money and hopefully become something of an idol. Back in the 50's, 60's and 70's, music represented culture and the fun in everyone's hearts, but now it stands for money.

As easily seen, all of today's "stars" are only pathetic wimps compared to the bands of the 1970's. Britney Spears, Avril Lavigne – they've all come and gone. The most unlikely and unruly of all artists are also jumping to the top of the hill. 50 Cent and Kanye West are both "meanies," yet have helped rap replace rock n' roll as the most popular music genre in the United States. This is just another way that music is being destroyed by the worst.

Whatever happened to the Beatles, Pink Floyd, AC/DC, Eagles and even Australia's Little River Band? Killed by a horrible transformation from the classics to the unoriginal. The music industry *won't* be able to heal this wound. This generation of children and teenagers has grown up listening to this music, and their likings will spread until the next generation continues it.

DISCLAIMER:

News8 is not responsible for any controversies caused by this newsletter. We reserve the right to remove “offensive” comments unless over 100+ people sign a petition to delete it. We can not guarantee accuracy of the facts and statistics presented in the article.